# PALATE-TECTONICS

## FYI

This aff was topic-specific but many of the framing and thesis cards are widely applicable. Therefore, I’ve omitted enough of the blocks and working pieces that you will have to spend some time thinking deeply about the position before it will be debate-ready.

You should have answers to many questions blocked out beforehand, as well as a general idea of what you need to accomplish in CX when debating various 1NCs. I’ve included a couple of these and left the headers for things I think you can or ought to fill in on your own.

### CX Questions

Ask the judge before the debate if they’ll vote for an aff w/ no role of the judge.

The role of the judge is to vote for the debater who best explores affective engagement with the outside.

#### AT Counterplan

[omitted]

#### AT K

I don’t really understand your link story. Which part of the aff do you disagree with?

* Pin down links.
* Pin down how exactly the alt differs. Exploit vagueness. Explain their K better than they do.
* Figure out how their framing reprioritizes offense. If your offense links you will only need to make weighing arguments; if it does not link you will have to spend more time answering their impact framing.

#### AT Theory

[omitted – you need to write your own theory interactions and they need to be GOOD]

#### AT Phil

[omitted]

### CX Answers

#### Why vote aff?

[omitted]

#### What ought the judge do?

[omitted]

#### What is the purpose of the aff/debate?

[omitted]

#### What is geotraumatics?

[omitted]

#### What is affect?

[omitted]

#### What is openness?

[omitted]

#### What is the problem the aff resolves?

[omitted]

#### Does the aff [affirm the resolution]?

Yes – it affirms because [omitted]

#### What is the point of the video? Does it affirm independently?

Up to you to decide whether you want to bite the bullet on this one.

# 1AC – Geotraumatics

### 1AC

Play *Nick Land – Meltdown*,

5:10 – 6:02

<https://youtu.be/fiaWsgtJrNI?t=5m10s>

Land 94, Nick. Meltdown. *YouTube*.com. Published 4 January 2016, created 1994, ccru.net

[the italicized text is kinda a mess and way too florid for my tastes but some K debaters seem to like that? So here you go]

#### *Debaters pour so much energy into critiquing and interpreting the meanings of speech. Is that word hateful, or powerful? Are these vocalizations useful for the pursuit of truth, or do they compromise the safety of our interlocutors? What is the proper role of critical inquiry on college campuses?*

#### *But these investigations neglect the physical act of speaking:*

#### Speech is first and foremost a production of sound and vibration from muscles in the body, evolutionarily shaped into semantically rich phonemes. We often take for granted this visceral substrate of our interpretive capacities, but the crash and rumble of sound waves emanating from our vocal cords, thrumming through our bodies and into the air, marks a profound evolutionary trauma. This AC attempts to excavate the traumatic genesis of phonetics – it escapes from the pained constraints of our evolved bodies in the direction of cybernetic engagements with sound.

Land 99 [Land, Nick (prophet of intensive zero). “Barker Speaks.” *Abstract Culture: Digital Hyperstition.* London: CCRU, 1999. Rpt. in *Fanged Noumena: Collected Writings 1987–2007*. Eds. Robin Mackay and Ray Brassier. Falmouth: Urbanomic, 2012. Print. pp. 502. // WWXR 2016-7-21]

PALATE-TECTONICS

Due to erect posture the head has been twisted around, shattering vertebro-perceptual linearity and setting up the phylogenetic preconditions for the face. This right­angled pneumatic-oral arrangement produces the vocal­apparatus as a crash-site, in which thoracic impulses collide with the roof of the mouth. The bipedal head becomes a virtual speech-~~impediment~~, a sub-cranial pneumatic pile-up, discharged as linguo-gestural development and cephalization take-off. Burroughs suggests that the protohuman ape was dragged through its body to expire upon its tongue. Its is a twin-axial system, howls and clicks, reciprocally articulated as a vowel-consonant[s] phonetic palette, rigidly intersegmented to repress staccato-hiss continuous variation and its attendant becomings-animal. That's why stammerings, stutterings, vocal tics, extralingual phonetics, and electrodigital voice synthesis are so laden with biopolitical intensity – they threaten to bypass the anthropostructural head-smash that establishes our identity with logos, escaping in the direction of numbers.

#### The aff’s creative fictiontelling contends that geotrauma, or geological and organismic change as propelled by traumatic incursions from an alien outside, lies at the core of a transcendental unconscious that structures all being. Not just human subjectivity – matter too is vital.

#### Geotraumatics explains the progression of human vocalization – from guttural shrieks and howls to laryngeal speech – as an affliction. The aff’s theory-fiction is a performative syncretism that enables us to confront this primary trauma.

Mackay and Brassier 12 [Mackay, Robin (Lemurian voyager), and Ray (bae) Brassier. “Editors’ Introduction.” *Fanged Noumena: Collected Writings 1987–2007*. Eds. Robin Mackay and Ray Brassier. Falmouth: Urbanomic, 2012. Print. pp. 39–42. // WWXR 2016-7-21]

The inception of the amorphous and short-lived Cybernetic Culture Research Unit (CCRU) - established at Warwick University in 1995, shortly before Land's departure from academia, but immediately disowned as an undesirable parasite by the institution to which it was precariously axed (it survived for a few years afterwards as an independent entity) - marks yet another important phase-transition in Land's work. Arguably the most significant component of this stage is the theory of 'geotraumatics', which marks Land's audacious attempt[s] (following A Thousand Plateaus' 'Geology of Morals') to characterise all terrestrial existence, including human culture, as a relay of primal cosmic trauma. Radicalising Freud's equation of trauma with what is most enigmatic and problematic in existence, Land generalises its restricted biocentric model as outlined in Beyond the Pleasure Principle to encompass the inorganic domain, singling out the accretion of the earth 4.5 billion years ago - the retraction of its molten outer surface and its subsequent segregation into a burning iron core (which he dubs Cthell as the aboriginal trauma whose scars are inscribed, encrypted, throughout terrestrial matter, instituting a register of unconscious pain coextensivc with the domain of stratified materiality as such. Land's reworking of the discredited biological notion that 'ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny' through Freud's theory of trauma hybridises genealogy, stratoanalysis and information theory into a cryptography of this cosmic pain. What howls for release in eukaryotic cells, carbon molecules, nerve ganglia, and silicone chips, are the 'thermic waves and currents, deranged particles, ionic strippings and gluttings' that populate the planet's seething inner core. Geotraumatics radicalises Deleuze-Guattari's insistence that schizoanalysis should extend further than the terrain of personal or familial drama, to invest the social and political realms, and pushes beyond history and biology to incorporate[s] the geological and the cosmological within the purview of the transcendental unconscious. Behind what seem like absurdities – such as the claim that lumbar back pain is an expression of geocosmic trauma – lies the contention that the root source of the disturbance which the organism identifies according to its parochial frame of reference - mummy-daddy - or which it construes in terms of the threat of individual death, is a more profound trauma rooted in physical reality itself, a generalised alienation endemic to the stratification of matter as such. What is noteworthy here is a certain deepening of pessimism: repression extends 'all the way down' to the cells of the body, the rocks of the earth, inhering in organised structure as such. All things, not just the living, yearn for escape; all things seek release from their organisation, which however induces further labyrinthine complications. Nothing short of the complete liquidation of biological order and the dissolution of physical structure can suffice to discharge the aboriginal trauma that mars terrestrial existence.

As Nietzsche suggested, the structure and usage of the human body is the root source of the system of neurotic afflictions co-extensive with human existence; but bipedalism, erect posture, forward facing vision, the cranial verticalisation of the human face, the laryngeal constriction of the voice, are themselves all indices of a succession of geotraumatic catastrophes separating the material potencies of the body from its stratified actuality. Just as the bipedal head impedes 'vertebro-perceptual linearity', the human larynx inhibits 'virtual speech'. One cannot dismantle the face without also evacuating the voice. Since in geotraumatic terms, the human voice itself is – via the various accidents of hominid evolution – the expression of geotrauma, 'stammerings, stutterings, vocal tics, extralingual phonetics, and electrodigital voice synthesis are […] laden with biopolitical intensity - they threaten to bypass the anthropostructural head-smash that establishes our identity with logos, escaping in the direction of numbers.' Texts such as ' KataConiX' accordingly attempt a performative evacuation of the voice, disintegrating semantics into intensive sequence (notably through the use of extracts from Artaud's notebooks, where 'poetry' slides into delirious combinatorics). One of the tasks of schizoanalysis has now become the decrypting of the ' tics' bequeathed to the human frame by the geotraumatic catastrophe, and 'KataConiX' treats vestigial semantic content as a mere vehicle for code 'from the outside': the 'tic' symptoms of geotraumatism manifested in the shape of sub-linguistic clickings and hissings. Already disintegrated into the number-names of a hyperpagan pantheon, syncretically drawing on the occult, nursery rhyme, anthropology, S F and Lovecraft, among other sources, the 'subterranean current of impressions, correspondences, and analogies'(Artaud) beneath language is now allowed uninhibited (but rigorously-prepared) development, in an effort to corporeally de-engineer the organicity of logos.

#### Geotraumatics is helpful for opening ourselves up to the outside – it challenges the boundary between human and non-human, consciousness and matter, life and un-life. It forces us to consider how our subjectivity is formed by trauma, the trauma of remaining open to the invasive sensory overflow from outside.

Matts & Tynan 12 [Matts, Tim, and Aidan Tynan (Cardiff University). “Geotrauma and the Eco-Clinic: Nature, Violence, and Ideology.” *symploke* Vol. 20, Nos. 1-2 (2012) ISSN 1069-0697, 91-110 // WWXR]

Against this, we propose a form of ecological thinking that takes as its object not nature but the unnaturalisable as such, drawing on the concept of geotrauma or geotraumatics, as suggested by Nick Land and elaborated by Reza Negarestani. Geotrauma helps us to rethink the relation between the human and non-human by embracing a notion of violence reducible to neither side of that division. As Land points out, for Freud, the notion of trauma corresponds to a breach or invasion, the emergence of something into the conscious system, which that system struggles to assimilate (Land 2011, 333). As Freud writes in Beyond the Pleasure Principle (1961), consciousness is formed as a protective barrier against stimuli from the external world, and traumas are the result of a penetration of this barrier: “we describe as ‘traumatic’ any excitations from outside which are powerful enough to break through the protective shield. It seems to me that the concept of trauma necessarily implies a connection of this kind with a breach in an otherwise efficacious barrier against stimuli” (23). For Freud, a psychoneurosis results from the fact that traumatic breaches may occur also from stimuli originating from within, in the form of psychic instincts or drives. The fact of trauma means that there can be no formal settling of what belongs inside and what must be kept outside. Both unconscious and conscious systems develop as relative adaptations to traumatic incisions, the origins of which can never be completely localised. It becomes, from the point of view of the neurotic subject, impossible to tell which came first, the traumatic element or the system itself, such that this impossibility is the very ground of the neurosis. Extending this idea, Negarestani suggests, in his conference presentation “On the Revolutionary Earth,” that traumas are infinitely “nested,” one within the other, so that trauma has an ultimately geological and even cosmic extension: the geophilosophical synthesis (of the modern man qua citizen) is conditioned by a geocosmic concatenation of traumas or cuts in the axiomatic fabric of interiorities. Since there is no single or isolated psychic trauma (all traumas are nested), there is no psychic trauma without an organic trauma and no organic trauma without a terrestrial trauma that in turn is deepened into open cosmic vistas. (2011) Ecological “openness” can only be maintained on the basis of these traumatic incisions. Negarestani draws on Sandor Ferenczi’s conception of trauma as relating to “ururtrauma” (Ururtraumatischen), designating, in Ferenczi’s words, a “pre-primal trauma” or “scar” inherent to the subject- object relationship (qtd in Bokanowski 2009, 108). Ururtrauma develops the idea that, as Negarestani puts it, “no matter how originary and precursory a trauma is, there is still another trauma to which it can be deepened, another trauma by which the infinite inter-connected traumas can be widened” (2011). On this view, any localised field or region is conditional upon an incision into a prior field, and so on in a “nested” fashion. In this sense, the relation between the human and the non-human world is conditioned by a prior complicity of “cuts” separating the biological from the geological, the terrestrial from the cosmic, and so on: the Earth itself was formed in relation to the trauma of the sun and stellar death, while the iron formed in the heat of the silicon burning process provided the metabolic agent for the earliest life forms. Life as a generative process is intimately related to the traumatic openings, the trauma of being opened, around which systems of interiority— what we will later in this paper call “strata”—are formed.

#### Critique is outmoded and despotic – it systematizes knowledge and culture in the service of a higher calling. Resist the drive to save the world – caring is creepy, usefulness is overrated – it’s better to drift in the unknown, exploring and unleashing forces far beyond our ken.

Mackay and Brassier 12 [Mackay, Robin (Lemurian voyager), and Ray (bae) Brassier. “Editors’ Introduction.” *Fanged Noumena: Collected Writings 1987–2007*. Eds. Robin Mackay and Ray Brassier. Falmouth: Urbanomic, 2012. Print. pp. 12–17. // WWXR 2016-7-21]

Whereas for Kant, the fruits of this cruel discipline—reason and aesthetic contemplation—precede in principle its traumatic flowering in sublime sentiment, in Land's genealogical-materialist re-reading, the intimidation and excruciation of animality upon the traumatic awareness of its own finitude is in fact the effective condition for the construction of beauty and reason, not its epiphenomenal consequence. The productive imagination, or schematism—in Kant, the basic faculty that is stimulated by and responds creatively to matter—is the faculty that is most suspect, most tainted by the 'animality' of primary conjugation, that appropriative process of taking up the raw material of sensibility and 'coining' it. The constriction of this faculty of synthetic intelligence (what Land will call 'animality' or 'cunning' or simply 'intelligence') followed inevitably by its pathologisation, is the foundation of reason, which seeks to arrogate all powers of acting to itself and its purity. Thus what lies behind the Kantian 'trial' of pure reason is a bloody military coup, a seizure of power. The traumatic experience of the sublime relays the triumph of Reason's all-out war on the animal, the excessive nature of which, however, betrays the precarious transcendental level. This is the fundamental destratification to which Land subjects the Kantian apparatus. Kant's theory of the spontaneous inventiveness of genius presents the same figure as that of pathological animality, the violent, feral urge towards becoming-inferior that must be suppressed by practical philosophy: an impersonal, energetic unconscious emerges as the as-yet unacknowledged problematic of Occidental philosophy. Non-agentic, lacking the intentional intelligibility of Kant's 'will', and with no regard for architectonic order, this transcendental unconscious is an insurgent field of forces for whose cunning—as Nietzsche would discover—even 'reason' itself is but an instrument. Anticipating the psychoanalytical conception of 'desire', Schopenhauer and Nietzsche consummate the collapse of intentional transparency into the opacity of a contingent and unknown 'will', a 'purposiveness without purpose' whose unmasterable irruptions are in fact dissipations—pathological by definition—of energy excessive to that required for (absorbed by) the 'work' of being human. At once underlying and overflowing the 'torture chamber of organic specificity', or 'Human Security System', this inundation creates 'useless' new labyrinths, unemployable new fictions that exceed any attempt to systematise knowledge or culture. What is arguably most significant for Land in this suppressed 'libidinal materialist' strain of post-Kantianism is its re-materialisation of the Socratic idealisation of 'questioning'. This libidinal re-materialisation of critique reconfigures questioning as exploration, whose orienting vector runs from the known towards the unknown, rather than from the unknown to the known: 'What if knowledge were a means to deepen unknowing?', Land asks. Critique and exploration are the two possible but mutually antagonistic continuations of the predicament of an interrogative impulse whose corrosive unleashing in principle from all authority—coded in Kantian critique, but whose real effects are found in capitalist modernity—undermines Enlightenment optimism. Critique and deconstruction part company with the materialist and exploratory fork of post-Kantianism at the point at which, despite all their hostility to Kantian rationalism, they follow Kant in supposing the unknown to be the negative residue of conceptual appropriation, and hence a 'non-identity' or 'differance' whose disruptive effects can be tracked and diagnosed within the conceptual or ideological registers (even if this interminable pursuit can never be consummated in the mythical parousia of absolute identity or self-presence). Accordingly, throughout these texts, Land regularly chides critique and deconstruction for a latent conservatism that belies their pretensions to radicality. Their critiques of calculation mask an instrumentalisation of epoche—the abyss of unknowing, the enigma of exteriority—designed to perpetuate the inexhaustible dialectic or differance of Logos. Their post-metaphysical caution perpetuates the Socratic ideal of philosophy as a 'preparation for death' whereby philosophy lingers at the brink of the unknown while hoping to domesticate this threshold as a habitus for thought. Perhaps Nietzsche's most important insight for Land is that it is the 'disturbing and enigmatic' character of the world alone that impels thought towards the unknown; but an unknown that is no longer a hiatus or lacuna within the concept, since it indexes the un-idealisable exteriority of matter construed as real difference. 'Matter' is no longer the name of a recognisable substance, but a cypher for the unknown; 'materialism' is no longer a pretext for critique but a vector of exploration. Land's pessimistic or Dionysian materialism abandons the Apollonian ideal of achieving order or reconciliation (even interminably deferred), seeking only to cause more trouble, to complexify, disrupt, disturb, provoke, and intensify. Accordingly, Land aims to plug philosophy into the 'indecent precipitation' of the poet-werewolf-rat-genius, whose operating principle is, like Artaud's spiritual plague, 'epidemic rather than hermeneutic'; who, like Nietzsche's arrow, transmits the epoche, chaos, the irruptions of the energetic unconscious, as opposed to capitalising (on) them; and whose subjection to the polite deliberations, hard work, and heavy responsibilities of critique or deconstruction Land dismisses as a travesty. Only the dissolution of 'actually­ existing philosophy' might open the way to new practices capable of participating in the exploratory 'intelligence' of those infected by the unknown.

#### Affective analysis is key – Empire is a mood of domination that outflanks resistance strategies, reducing exploration to useless knowledge. It is necessary to fight on the same playing field as Empire, to explore and unleash its own forces against it – all other strategies fail.

Constantinou 12 [Constantinou, Marios (University of Cyprus). “Venus Imperatrix: The Moods of Empire.” *Parallax* 18.4, 2012. pp. 1–5. // WWXR 2016-5-8]

What is under examination is Empire as an affective disclosure. What kind of world do imperial moods disclose? Being an affective intentionality without a subject, Empire discloses projects, involvements and logics of taking care of business which betray, as Michel Foucault has argued, a certain directionality of biopower whose overall effect escapes anyone’s intention in particular. Empire, then, is a state of mind, a fundamental mood; a mode of attunement where the biopower of the imperial bourgeoisie of the 19th century which served as a strategy of its selfconstitution has by now evolved into a mood of global domination not only over collaborative elites aspiring to partnership but also over peoples. The thrilling mood of postmodern biopower, namely, the mood of ‘getting ready to be transfigured’ was captured for a moment by Hélène Cixous: ‘who knows who I shall be, a moment from now, in the fertile night’ of Empire?5 Empire is the essential moodiness of Classical Imperialism, its clamorous self-duplicity disclosed anew in relative autonomy, so to speak, from its original models. Living through a gestation process at the heart of Central European Imperial metaphysics, Heidegger profoundly sensed both its disclosive and self-destructive moods. Although the moral assessment and juridical indictment of Nazism has more or less been orderly completed, Heidegger’s critical engagement with the neo-Roman foundations of Western imperialism remains, with rare exceptions, obscurely silenced.6 However there are still sufficient (and original) grounds for questioning these intellectual and affective tropes of Western imperialism. Heidegger anticipated that the inherently biopolitical moods of Empire would co-exist and co-evolve with imperialist terror; the existential withdrawal of a world that up until then was taken for granted as inert raw material, a mere standing reserve. Heidegger’s Being and Time, along with his lectures on Parmenides, are in many respects masterful investigations of the neo-Roman tropes of Empire. Heidegger remains, in my view, a forgotten but suggestive resource for a critical re-examination of the current dispositions of Empire as an indeterminable biopolitical terrain. Heidegger’s lesson, with regard to the present engagement, is relevant to the dual nature of imperial pacifism: humanistic and at the same time immanently related to war pathologies. Attuned to Heidegger’s critique, one could note that what is despicable is its ignoble, unconfessed and unconfessable violence which is philistine, cow hearted, lily-livered, weak-kneed and, at the same time, beastly, ferocious and relentless. Those who legitimize imperial peace commit the most contemptible form of violence, perpetrating the most cowardly assault. In Heidegger’s sense, they are the new arrivals of last men and women, evangelizing peace on imperial terms. If there is a critical legacy for thought after the fascist disaster that is it: the dual nature of the Empire of the last man and the unending completion of an American ivf metaphysics. Upon reflection, the moods of Empire disclose a fundamental ambiguity, particularly its manipulative, double-eyed biopolitical diplomacy. We are living through times when any reference to ‘imperialism’ sounds like the idle talk of a bygone era that memory cannot recall. We cannot but test the principal axioms of the New International Order against its master moods which neither disclose perpetual peace nor perpetual war but an ambiguous demarcation between the two, moving in and out of these states swiftly and without forewarning, hence trivializing both. In other words, there is still something fraudulently Roman about Empire – its commanding gaze, moods and disciplines – which confers upon any concept of politics an empty resonance. The Third Reich may be gone but the commanding logic of Roman interpellation as an imperial perspective is still our enduring condition. According to Heidegger, in Parmenides the defining feature of imperial actio proper alludes not to war but to the logic of fallere; of bringing down to fall by deceptive circumvention, by going around. In other words, commanding as a logic of imperial actio entails a constant surmounting, a deceptive outflanking, a circumspicio whose circular, periscopic, all encompassing revolving gaze turns the enemy’s resistance around.7 Ambiguity remains the privileged mood and disciplinary pedagogy of our imperial postmodernity. This mood in the sense of disposition ought then to be read in an extended Heideggerian sense which includes modes of disposing order and methods of pacification – that is, the biopolitical sovereignty of an uncircumscribed imperium consisting of formal commands, informal decrees and injunctions. The all-knowingness of ambiguous everyday structures of groundless hearsay or idle talk, spying or curiosity, furnishes the global biopower of Empire with average understandability, insatiably investigating and understanding everything, but learning nothing. This commonsensical ambiguity of ‘diaphanous’ publicity is the unsurpassable ontological structure of Empire as it stands. Its forces of simulation reduce any possibility of counteraction to an already belated, collateral and derivative status. So much for the ambiguous openness of Empire, Commonwealth and governance. We are all attuned into it! We rise and fall together! Heidegger’s insights into the structure of imperial command can be traced back to Nietzsche’s axiomatic style. Nietzsche’s account of affect as a hallmark of command schematizes genealogically the intriguing self-duplicity of biopower and its moodalities capable of de-powering resistance to it. The principal preoccupation of this intervention is to rethink the concept of Empire in terms of definable affects and effects: that is, by recollecting its luxurious yet bare will to biopower, the aimless striving of the will to will. Empire in this Nietzschean sense of decadence is both the commanding and obeying party – governing and opposing through NGOs, managing Right and Left and embodying contradictory drives and articulations of affect.

#### I defend public colleges and universities in the United States ought not any restrict Constitutionally protected speech.

#### Philosophy and the university as currently constituted suppress dissent and reify restrictive power relations. The argument is not merely state bad, but rather there needs to exist more open modes of engagement with state power.

Land 92 Nick, Bataille’s personal erotica author. *The Thirst for Annihilation: Georges Bataille and Virulent Nihilism.* London: Routledge (1992). // WWXR 2015/7/30

Little progress can be made in interpreting this conflict so long as one remains attached to idealistic notions of ‘controversy’ or ‘debate’. The constitution of debates is the dominant mode of pacification employed by the university: the validation of certain manageable conflicts within the context of institutionalization, moderation, and the indefinite deferral of consequences. What is transcendental to academic debate is submission to socio-economic power. It might even be fair to suggest that it is Schopenhauer who first spoils the possibility of debate in this case; that Heidegger, for instance, is already provoked. The famous story about Schopenhauer setting his lectures at the same times as Hegel would be an example of this; a dramatization of the relation of exclusion that is at least as basic to the university as dialogue. Anybody who dismisses this gesture as mere perversity is lending implicit credence to the notion that the university gives each a chance to speak, providing a neutral space for the encounter of divergent types of thought. Schopenhauer does not take any such suggestion of academic impartiality seriously: the state has at all times interfered in the philosophical disputations of the universities and has taken sides, no matter whether it was a question of Realists and Nominalists, or Aristotelians and Ramists, or Cartesians and Aristotelians, of Christian Wolf, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, or anything else [Sch VII 187]. Furthermore, the intervention of the state is a perpetually operative force that is immanent to the institution itself. University philosophy polices itself as part of its sordid flirtation with state power: It never occurs to a professor of philosophy to examine a new system that appears to see whether it is true; but he at once tests it merely to see whether it can be brought into harmony with the doctrines of established religion, with government plans, and with the prevailing views of the times. After all this he decides its fate [Sch VII 167].

#### Openness must be unrestricted and unrestrained – endorsing the domestication of radical, exploratory openness enshrines the survival instinct which locks us into a valueless existence.

**Negarestani ‘8** Reza (Iranian philosopher, artist, and writer; contributes to Collapse and CTheory regularly), “cyclonopedia: complicity with anonymous materials” p.195-199

In the mid-eighties, before succumbing to his petromantic nympholepsy, Hamid Parsani re-addresses his book, Defacing the Ancient Persia, as a guide to strategic openness (which, he insists, is the enduring concern of the Middle East). Following his analysis of the Aryanistic holocaust and its relationship with the genealogy of monotheism, the book indeed can be read as a syncretic approach to a broad array of communications and modes of living in the Middle East, an openness with a polytical edge, as he emphasizes: ‘It **[openness] is certainly not made for social dynamics or lifestyles instrumentalized within liberal societies. Openness is what turns the very body of the free world upside down throughout human history — if, of course, we assume that the free world has ever been more than a mere institution of a more tolerable regime or religion**,’ Parsani writes in his later notes on Defacing the Ancient Persia. The book had already been tagged by hostile critics as ‘a maximalist and verbose treatise about everything except Persia, informed by every discipline except archeology’ and hailed by a few disciples as ‘the obligatory reference book for traveling to the Middle East’. In any case, it is more than a misreading to take Parsani’s Defacing the Ancient Persia for a mere collection of phenomenal discoveries and theories. As Parsani himself confesses, his book pursues an awkward dissection of the conundrum of openness in the Middle East’.34 If the so-called despotic institutions of the Middle East have survived liberalism, and have grown stronger instead of being shattered into miserable pieces long ago, it is because **openness can never be extracted from the inside of the system or through a mere** voluntary **or subjective** desire **for being open.** Openness can never be communicated by liberalism (not to mention the free world’). According to his critics, Parsani’s re-reading of Defacing the Ancient Persia aims to remobilize its already fleshed-out topics on the current Tellurian Dynamics with the fluid efficiency of petroleum’ (Parsani’s phrase). For Parsani, however, this process of re-writing (or reinterpretation’, according to critics) had the virtue of gathering all of his inquiries under the enigma of openness: It seems to me that so-called middle-eastern life, more than anything else, suggests a communication dynamics, and is an answer to the enigma of openness rather than being a contemporary orientalist lifestyle with a political or humanist edge. **In the light of Parsani’s references to ‘the enigma of openness’, the Hyperstition team decided to question and reinvestigate its early notes on openness in relation to Deleuze and Guattari’s politics of becoming. However, this time the reading was not conducted on wholly philosophical grounds but rather against a new background, that of the mess-hysteria of Parsani’s works — a textual sketch resistant to any high-octane philosophical psychosis.** In this way, Parsani’s works could be hammered out new edges and relevancies. In Defacing the Ancient Persia**, human history is an experimental research process in designing** and establishing **modes of openness to the outside. Openness is not ultimately, so to speak, the affair of humans, but rather the affair of the outside — everything minus the human,** even the human’s own body. But openness is not only associated with human history. Parsani argues that the Earth, as the arch-puppeteer and occult-manipulator of planetary events, has a far more sophisticated openness of its own. **If the human is the subject of openness or the one who opens himself to his outside, then the Earth is ‘the inside-out subject’ of human openness.** Undoubtedly, human openness is full of twists. This includes social openness, gender communications, and openness between populations and governments of the contemporary world, whether cultural or petrological. Parsani shows that human openness has a strategic and twisted spirit for which every communication is a tactic and every openness is a strategy to be unfolded. If this is the case, then the Earth must enjoy a womb-dark and an ocean-deep scheme — if not conspiracy — in its openness and communications with both organisms and its solar outside. It is difficult to study the politics, culture and economy of the world without questioning its issues and concerns regarding the ethics of openness. Middle-eastern studies would be impossible without the question of openness. (Anush Sarchisian in her comments on Defacing the Ancient Persia, 1994) **Openness comes from the Outside,** not the other way around. **Nietzschean affirmation was never intended to support liberation or even to be about openness at all. It was an invocation of the outside, in its exteriority to the human and even to the human’s openness (which includes desires for being open to the outside).** Radical openness has nothing to do with the cancelation of closure; it is a matter of terminating all traces of parsimony and grotesque domestication that exist in so-called emancipatory human openness. The blade of radical openness thirsts to butcher economical openness, or any openness constructed on the affordability of both the subject and its environment. The target of radical openness is not closure but economical openness. **Radical openness devours all economic and political grounds based on ‘being open’. Affirmation does not attain openness to the world but** maintains closure **progressively through the grotesque domestications of economical openness. On the first level of its operation, affirmation advocates ‘being open to’ as a**n **anthropomorphic and regulated mode of openness; it renders everything more affordable, more economically open and more purposeful. Affirmation is initially involved with the manipulation of the boundaries (of systems) whose machinery is based on transforming openness into an instance of affordability, turning economic openness into a survival economy. Economical openness is not about how much one can be open to the outside,** but about how much one can afford the outside. Therefore, openness, in this sense, is intrinsically tied to survival. The survival economy, in the same vein, is the realization of all manifestations of communication as the prolonging of survival; affordability in all its forms guarantees survival.

#### But, life is exterior to the act of survival – the only ethical act is to affirm the present tense as a form of nourishment for the Outside. Exploring the boundaries of affect and trauma is key.

**Negarestani ‘8** Reza (Iranian philosopher, artist, and writer; contributes to Collapse and CTheory regularly), “cyclonopedia: complicity with anonymous materials” p.195-199

**The problematic of Life can be superficially — if not ironically — embraced by posing this question: Generally, we believe that life makes survival possible; but if life is the source of living then why do we need to survive? If life is the so-called vital source, then why is the act of living as an appropriation and a survivalist regulation necessary? Why is survival possible, or** do we need to survive if life is already a source of living? Once we realize that the ethics of life is external to that of survival, and that survival is a resistance to the epidemic and overpowering presence of life, then we can say that to be pro-life is to be essentially anti-survival. Yet more grievously, when it comes to the exteriority of life to the living being, survival is intrinsically impossible. In the third chapter of his book, Parsani suggests that the Aryans who settled on the Iran plateau were exceptionally flexible in regard to their environment. Flexibility was the central element of the circumspect politics of the Ar**yans, both for survival and for keeping their [the Aryans’] genetic purity intact; the two most** crucial **objectives which led them to migrate and spread along a long path from Asia to Europe. It was not, in fact, their desire for peace that continually pushed the Aryans to be open to new people — especially the original populations of the regions they occupied — but** fear of their doom, **monomania for noble perfectionist purity and monopolistic hygiene.** The Aryans’ obsession for exclusion had to be pursued by any means possible, even by selective and controlled inclusion of other populations. For the Aryans everything took place at the edge of survival and purity — a purity which had to be maintained through closure as an carefully appropriated and regulated openness’, a flexible but severely restricted and economical openness whose limits are mapped by affordance and dynamic capacity: I am open to you as long as I can afford you and what you bring for me. The most effective way to survive and to save the purging purity of the race — to live unpolluted — was to blend in with the crowd. This was the Aryan stratagem. However, it proved to be a total misadventure for the Aryans who settled on the Iran plateau: They made themselves open to the sorcerous popuation of the plateau for whom everything was external to survival. For this population, unlike the Aryans, openness was effectuated as the exteriorization of life to survival, a silent aggression against survival from within. **When you open the door for someone, anyone can come in; and once they enter, they unlock doors of their own. Following the Aryans’ stratagem, Cyrus 11(550-530 BC) would be able to expand the Persian Empire with no real obstacle, except for the northern nomads who fiercely resisted the outbreak of this new soft domination. Cyrus conquered Babylonia (Babel) and Egypt, and many other territories, one after another, attached them to his still-larval empire whose growth was dangerously rapid.** This new empire tried to assimilate the whole of Asia, Africa and Europe by the single formula of initial conflict followed by peace with the enemy — after conquering their land — by believing in their beliefs and affirming their request to be free in the realm of Aryans’. The people living on the Iran plateau before the Aryans arrived were adept sorcerers and necromancers. **For them, life’ was not survival, nor was survival identified with ‘evading death’. Survival was not a reactionary process to (Un) life, nor a temporary anthropomorphic escape out of which death’s inevitability rises. Death unfolds through the process of live-ing or survival from the outset to the end as a predestined necrocratic regime.** Survival presupposes death from the beginning**; so-called actual death is merely the eventuation of the real death, or the impossibility of survival in affording the exteriority of life. The course of living or survival is where death not only becomes a terminus-event but a propulsive and conducting power which starts to work even before one begins to live (death becomes the director of one’s life)**. **The ethos of survival or** vitalism is necrocracy. **For the sorcerous crowd of the pre-Aryan lran plateau, survival was not supposed to hold death back as long as possible but to feed the (Un)life. For them, survival and the scrabbling will to survive were sorcerous rituals to feed the Outside, to feed what is external to ‘so-called life as live-ing’, an occult practice for feeding the avatars of the Outside. Living was itself a feeding project, and survival in general was a strategy,** the most pragmatic polytics for engaging the Outside. They believed that survival fed an unthinkable Abomination, an ultimate outsider which their Zoroastrian descendants called Druj. The longer you endure, the more you feed the Outside (interlocking with the outside on the plane of strategy). In the Avestan language of ancient Persia, Druj — from a Sanskrit origin — meant blackening, the chaotic aspects of falsity, fraud and strategy. The idea of ritual as a communion with this openness, then, developed the pragmatics of a new survival system practically and religiously conscious of its own repression and the exteriority of life.

# 1AR Frontline

# Case Extensions

The extensions were structured as several thematic overviews meant to respond to broad classes of arguments. This facilitates a lot of 2AR explanation and allows you to make easier cross-applications across flows. Some features I’m proud of: (1) they are, I think, fairly flowable; (2) the quotations add ethos; (3) the arguments are complete enough that I would be able to do much of my 1AR work on various K or theory flows just off this section of the document, relying on the longer frontlines below if a K or theory flow filled a significant portion of 1NC time allocation.

### video

#### I’m the only one affectively engaging with the physicality of speech – the video at the beginning of the aff is the only attempt to perform the “electrodigital voice synthesis” whose “biopolitical intensity” challenges logos – that’s Land 99. This performance links the physicality of speech to speculative fictions about human evolution and geocosmic trauma – key to coming to terms with the primary trauma that structures all existence – that’s Mackay and Brassier.

### topic

#### Restrictions on speech are a regulated, economical mode of openness to the outside that the aff criticizes. They foreclose engagement with the speech of others and the physical constraints of our bodies – they focus on “how much one can afford the outside” ’s dangerous speech – that’s Negarestani. Two, their rational justifications for restriction constitute a reification of logos that destroys value to existence – that’s Mackay and Brassier. Three, this attempt to enclose the outside IS the “struggles to assimilate” the trauma of uncomfortable speech I criticize – it recreates the problem – that’s Matts and Tynan. Four, restrictions are an imperial mood of domination – they are an “articulation” of how bodies ought to behave and create institutional rules that get coopted – that inevitably causes more domination and violence which outweighs – that’s Constantinou. Instead I affirm an unconditional openness to the possibility of vocalization from the outside – that’s Negarestani – justifies the plan.

### conseq k

#### The neg’s stance – promote good states of affairs, act in terms of aiming toward some value […] is an abandonment of a true ethics of the outside – voting aff becomes an ethical obligation prior to the rest of the flow – the round’s a question of our stance toward ethics – that’s the impact of Mackay and Brassier. The attempt to bring about a state of affairs is “constructed on [its] affordability” – prevents one from being opened by and unpredictably altered by that which is outside us – “Openness comes from the Outside, not the other way around” – that’s Negarestani. Outweighs – the drive to survive and succeed is “necrocracy” – means they’re inevitably controlled BY death rather than coming to terms with it – that’s Negarestani again. Two, affect is NOT a state of affairs – it’s a relationship we take up toward “exploration” – consequences irrelevant – that’s Mackay and Brassier. Three, the attempt to satisfy a telos is intrinsically opposed to the “process in designing modes of openness” that is our primary ethical imperative – that’s Negarestani. Outweighs – it accounts for the structure and history of human subjectivity and addresses the root cause – that’s Mackay and Brassier. Four, maximizing is bad, it’s a mode of affordance and an attempt to control the outside – always gets outflanked and coopted – that’s Negarestani and Constantinou. Five, we can never know the outside’s traumatic incursions – that’s Matts and Tynan. And the drive to assimilate the future into our knowledge is Empire’s “insatiabl[e] investigat[ion]” that destroys value. Six, it’s impossible – we are constructed in different ways and experience trauma differently – can’t aggregate pleasure – that’s Mackay and Brassier.

### nature

[omitted]

Interactions with anthro, Deleuze, theories of subject-formation, Kant, ontology kritiks, environmental kritiks. Useful impact filter for 2AR.

### trauma

[omitted]

Interactions with Deleuze, psychoanalysis, theories of subject-formation, Foucault, Wilderson, etc.

*ESSENTIAL to understanding the aff.*

### freedom k

#### They’ve conceded freedom is impossible – we are evolutionarily determined and structured by geotraumatic catastrophes far beyond our reach – that’s Land. And, their stance toward freedom prevents us from coming to terms with trauma that conditions and exceeds our subjectivity – “It becomes impossible to tell which came first, the traumatic element or the system” – that’s Matts and Tynan. Independent reason to affirm – they reify the root cause of all unfreedom – that’s INCREDIBLY clear in the first Mackay and Brassier card.

### indeterminism

#### They’ve conceded predictions and solvencies are impossible – the outside exceeds their logic of causality – the aff’s performance already answered this – “When you open the door for someone, anyone can come in; and once they enter, they unlock doors of their own” – that’s Negarestani. Takes out the CP.

### suffering

#### They attempt to secure themselves against the possibility of suffering, pain, and death – this stance is a “survivalist regulation” that “becomes the director of one’s life” – that’s Negarestani. Kills value to life: if you want to survive you must life a joyless existence, even stepping out of your house is risky – what if you get hit by a falling tree? We all die in the end. In the face of the inevitability of suffering and death, the aff chooses to conduct a “sorcerous ritual” of musical performance – this affirms an openness to the outside that is a true ethics of life – Negarestani means the aff’s the only coherent stance on this issue.

### truth

#### Truth is dead and we have killed it – logos is an “anthropostructural ” mode of control that is incoherent and traumatizing – it is part and parcel of our repression and constraint – that’s Land. Trauma exceeds its boundaries – that’s Matts and Tynan. They say the aff’s absurd, no link and impact turn – my investigation of geotrauma is a creative rereading of history and cosmology – addresses “the root source of […] afflictions [of] human existence” – that’s Mackay and Brassier. Coming to terms with this trauma requires the eradication of all forms of bodily structure – logic and truth especially – that’s Mackay and Brassier. Means only the aff can reconceptualize truth successfully.

### morals

#### Philosophy is evil – it attempts to recuperate morality to the subject and the world – but this moralism is inherently constraining that impacts to incoherency – that’s Land 99 – means you reject the NC. Two, people rationalize whatever they want to – morality betrays a “latent conservatism” that prevents true ethics – that’s Mackay and Brassier. This rationalization also feeds into imperial outflanking – it subverts effective resistance – that’s Constantinou. Three, the focus on rigid principles like […] prevents the design of exploratory vectors – that’s Negarestani. And this exploration is key to resolving the root cause of all evil – that’s Mackay and Brassier. Four, affect takes out the value. We can’t have a coherent account of morals or subjectivity or intention – Matts and Tynan indicates that these concepts are illusions concealing a primary trauma – and Constantinou impacts illusion as feeding into cycles of disciplinary pedagogy that turns the NC and outweighs – it’s a TJF. Five, the attempt to become moral is inimical to an ethos of openness toward the outside. They can never solve and the aff outweighs.

**Land 93** Nick, former Lecturer in Continental Philosophy at Warwick University, *Fanged Noumena* ed. Ray Brassier and Robin Mackay "Shamanic Nietzche" in *Nietzsche: A Critical Reader* 1993

The death of God is a religious event - a transgression, experiment in damnation, and stroke of antitheistic warfare - but this is not to say it is preeminently a crime. **Hell has no interest in our debauched moral currency.** To confuse reactive dabblings in sin with expeditions in damnation is Christian superficiality; the Dantean error of imagining that one could earn oneself an excursion in Hell, as if the infernal too was a matter of justice. **Our crimes are mere stumblings on the path to ruin; just as every projected Hell on Earth is a strict exemplar of idolatry. Transgression is not criminal action, but tragic fate; the intersection of an economically programmed apocalypse with the religious antihistory of poetry. It is the inevitable occurrence of impossibility**, which is not the same as death, but neither is it essentially different. This ambivalence responds to that of death 'itself', which is not ontological but labrynthine: a relapse of composition that is absolute to discontinuity, yet is nothing at the level of immanence. The **very individuality that would condition the possibility of a proprietary death could only be achieved if death were impossible. One dies because discontinuity is never realized, but this means that there is never 'one' who dies. Instead there is an unthinkable communication with zero, immanence, or the sacred. 'There is no feeling that throws one into exuberance with greater force than that of nothingness.** But **exuberance** is not at all annihilation; it is the surpassing of the shattered attitude, it **is transgression'**. (Bataille, *Ouevres*).

### identity

[omitted]

Interactions with race, gender, queerness, and other identity-based kritiks. Also useful for theories that rely on some view of identity construction – e.g. Butler.

### language

[omitted]

Interactions with theory, tricky arguments like planflaw, and language-based arguments (Parrish 04 in the Hobbes NC commonly read on JF17, Derrida more broadly).

### fairness

[omitted]

Interactions with theory and some morals NCs.

### education

[omitted]

Interactions with theory and generic K ROB arguments (e.g. Giroux). Very useful.

### debate a game

[omitted]

Interactions with the class of arguments that people often use to philosophically justify truth-testing – e.g. Nardin, constitutivism, analogies with sports like soccer.

### pessimism

Interactions with afropessimism and nihilism (Warren), as well as with utopian alternatives (read: many, many alternatives).

#### [tag omitted]

**Land 92** Nick, Bataille’s personal erotica author. *The Thirst for Annihilation: Georges Bataille and Virulent Nihilism.* London: Routledge (1992). // WWXR

By precipitating a non-dialogical collision with Hegel, Schopenhauer certainly demonstrated a measure of tactical ineptitude, but not strategic blindness. For it is difficult to imagine that anyone would want to suggest that an impartial space for the discussion of atheistic philosophy was available at the University of Berlin during the early 1820s. The power of Schopenhauer’s diagnosis is that it is able to attend simultaneously to both the metaphysical conflict between philosophy and monotheism and the institutional forestalling of this conflict. This amphibiousness invests his critique of optimism with an enduring energy of dissent. Optimism is the general form of apology; at once the key to the metaphysical commitments of theology and the protection of these commitments from vigorous interrogation. Monotheism, with its description of the world as the creation of a benevolent God, or at least, of a God that defines the highest conception of the good, jusifies an all pervasive optimistic framework for which being is worthy of protection. For the optimist revolt, critique, and every form of negativity must be conditioned by a projected positivity; one criticizes in order to consolidate a more certain edifice of knowledge, one revolts in order to establish a more stable and comfortable society, one struggles against reality in order to release being into the full positivity which is its due. All of which inevitably slows things down a great deal, because, unless one has a persuasive plan of the future, negativity is de-legitimated by a prior apologetic dogma. The suggestion is always that ‘at least this is better than nothing’, a slogan that some Leibnizian demon has probably scrawled above the gates of Hell (not that I have any argument with Hell). Whilst speculative thought is the logic of social progress, a realization of freedom by means of a gradual absorption of conditions into the collective subject of political action, pessimism is the affect process of unconditional revolt. The most bleak speculative reasoning still retains a commitment to the reality of progressive development, even if this is momentarily frozen into the implicit truth of an agonizing contradiction. If Adorno creates particular difficulties for such a contention it is because he creates equivalent difficulties for speculative thought, partly because he is abnormally sensitive to the irreducible ethnocentrism involved in Hegel’s thinking, an ethnocentrism which is related to, although ultimately more interesting than, the colonial triumphalism of his philosophy of history. Its basic character is a terror of regression to a primitiveness that would forsake the laborious advances of one’s Occidental ancestors, and this is in turn a symptom of the wretched Western nihilism that insists one has an immense amount to lose. That our history has been in any way beneficial is something Schopenhauer vigorously repudiates, and his vehement antihistoricism (which Nietzsche comes to massively overhaul) has at least this merit: it sets itself firmly against one of the basic apologetic motifs of Occidental societies. After all, we cannot use the word history without meaning a singular process that one population has inflicted on several others, as well as upon its own non-servile virtualities, a process that has combined gruesome accident with sustained atrocity. The speculative model of revolution is one of ‘taking over’, the pessimistic model is one of escape; on the one hand the overthrow of oppression-as-exploitation, and on the other the overthrow of oppression-as-confinement. Employing an ultimately untenable distinction it could be said that at the level of social description these models are at least as complimentary as they are exclusive; the extraction of labour power and the inhibition of free movement have been complicit in the domestication of the human animal since the beginning of settled agriculture. But at the level of strategy a certain bifurcation begins to emerge, leading Deleuze and Guattari, for instance, to tease apart a Western and an Eastern model of revolution, the latter being based on a block of partially repressed nomad desire, oriented to the dissolution of sedentary space and the liquidation of the state3. Of course, insofar as one is concerned with anything like a directly applicable concrete programme, Schopenhauer has little to offer; what is known of his politics has a definite reactionary slant, and he does not seem to have grasped either the chronic exterminatory tendencies of settled societies, or their deep arbitrariness. The alternative he proposes is one of departure in the mode of renunciation, which is to say, he lacked a nomadology, or failed to explore the delirial antilogic that leads out of the maze. This is a claim at the same level as that which accuses Hegel of lacking a convincing account of the specifically modern dominion of commodity production, and helps to explain the impulse to the concrete associated with Nietzsche and with Marx. Pessimism is not a value logically separable from an independent metaphysics, because the logical value of identity is itself a comfort of which pessimism destitutes us, whilst a metaphysics of the will subverts the autonomy or separability of value questions. In this sense, pessimism is the first truly transcendental critique, operated against being, and in particular against the highest being, by the impersonal negativity of time or denial. Schopenhauerians and Hegelians can travel a considerable distance together in submitting being unsparingly to its abolition in time, although, in the end, speculative thought exhibits a fear of regression that looks to a pessimistic perpective like an anti-primitivist ideology, serving the interests of pseudo-progressive Western societies. Marx’s famous appeal to the working class in the Communist Manifesto that they have ‘nothing to lose but their chains’ is open to both a speculative and a pessimistic interpretation, and it is perhaps the latter that unleashes its most uncompromising force.

### accelerationism

[omitted]

Interactions with capitalism and policymaking.

# ATs

# AT Theory

The extent to which you have to frontline topicality depends on whether your aff is topical. This one (ostensibly) was, so I didn’t frontline much.

## AT Topicality

### I meet

#### I meet – I affirm the whole resolution.

[omitted]

### Aff 1st

[omitted]

### CI

[omitted]

## AT ROB Theory

[omitted]

# AT K

## Generic

### Perm

#### Perm: Do the aff and all non-competitive parts of the alt.

[omitted]

## AT Antiblackness

[omitted]

#### [tag omitted – you need to line this down]

Eshun 98 [Eshun, Kodwo (concept engineer). *More Brilliant Than The Sun: Adventures in Sonic Fiction.* London: Quartet Books, 1998. pp. 00[-006]–00[-001]. // WWXR]

The music of Alice Coltrane and Sun Ra, of Underground Resistance and George Russell, of Tricky and Martina, comes from the Outer Side. It alienates itself from the human; it arrives from the future. Alien Music is a synthetic recombinator, an applied art technology for amplifying the rates of becoming alien. Optimize the ratios of excentricity. Synthesize yourself. From the outset, this Postsoul Era has been characterized by an extreme indifference towards the human. The human is a pointless and treacherous category. And in synch with this posthuman perspective comes Black Atlantic Futurism. Whether it's the AfroFuturist concrete of George Russell and Roland Kirk, the Jazz Fission of Teo Macero and Miles Davis, the World 4 Electronics of Sun Ra and Herbie Hancock, the Astro Jazz of Alice Coltrane and Pharoah Sanders, the cosmophonic HipHop of Dr Octagon and Ultramagnetic MCs, the post-HipHop of The Jungle Brothers and Tricky, the Spectral Dub of Scientist and Lee Perry, the offworld Electro of Haashim and Ryuichi Sakamoto, the despotic Acid of Bam Bam and Phuture, the sinister phonoseduction of Parliament's Star Child, the hyperrhythmic psychedelia of Rob Playford and Goldie, 4 Hero and A Guy Called Gerald, Sonic Futurism always adopts a cruel, despotic, amoral attitude towards the human species. In fact the era when the History of HipHop could exhaust Machine Music is long over. All those petitions for HipHop to be taken seriously, for the BBC to give Techno a chance, for House to receive a fair hearing: this miserable supplication should have ended years ago. For there's nothing to prove anymore: all these Rhythmachines are globally popular now. So no more forcefeeding you Bronx fables and no more orthodox HipHop liturgies. There are more than enough of these already. Instead More Brilliant than the Sun will focus on the Futurhythmachines within each field, offering a close hearing of music's internal emigrants only. The Outer Thought of Tricky, the Jungle Brothers with their remedy for HipHop gone i1lmatic, Aerosoul art theorist Rammellzee and his mythillogical systems of Gothic Futurism and Ikonoklast Panzerism. No history of Techno, however compelling, but instead a zoom in on the Underground Resistance WarMachine, on the Unidentifiable Audio Object of X-f02 Discovers The Rings ofSaturn'. No pleas for Jungle to be accorded proper respect, but rather a magnification of certain very particular aspects of its hyperdimensionality, in 4 Hero, A Guy Called Gerald, Rob Playford and Goldie. The history book that crams in everything only succeeds in screening out the strangeness of the Rhythmachine. In its bid for universality, such a book dispels the artificiality that all humans crave. By contrast, More Brilliant goes farther in. It lingers lovingly inside a single remix, explores the psychoacoustic fictional spaces of interludes and intros, goes to extremes to extrude the illogic other studies flee. It happily deletes familiar names [so no Tupac, no NWA] and historical precedence [no lying griots, not much King Tubby, just a small side bet on the Stockhausen sweepstakesl. It avoids the nauseating American hunger for confessional biography, for 'telling your own stories in your own words'. It refuses entry to comforting origins and social context. Everywhere, the 'street' is conSidered the ground and guarantee of all reality, a compulsory logic explaining all Black Music, conveniently mishearing antisocial surrealism as social realism. Here sound is unglued from such obligations, until it eludes all social responsibility, thereby accentuating its unreality principle. In CultStud, TechnoTheory and CyberCulture, those painfully archaic regimes, theory always comes to Music's rescue. The organization of sound is interpreted historically, politically, socially. Like a headmaster, theory teaches today's music a thing or 2 about life. It subdues music's ambition, reins it in, restores it to its proper place, reconciles it to its naturally belated fate. In More Brilliant than the Sun the opposite happens, for once: music is encouraged in its despotic drive to crumple chronology like an empty bag of crisps, to eclipse reality in its wilful exorbitance, to put out the sun. Here music's mystifying illogicality is not chastised but systematized and intensified - into MythSciences that burst the edge of improbability, incites a proliferating series of mixillogical mathemagics at once maddening and perplexing, alarming, alluring. MythScience is the field of knowledge invented by Sun Ra, and a term that this book uses as often as it can. A sample from Virilio defines it very simply: 'Science and technology develop the unknown, not knowledge. Science develops what is not rational.' Instead of theory saving music from itself, from its worst, which is to say its best excesses, music is heard as the pop analysis it already is. Producers are already pop theorists: Breakbeat producer Sonz of a Loop da Loop Era's term skratchadelia, instrumental HipHop producer DJ Krush's idea of turntabilization, virtualizer George Clinton's studio science of mixadelics, all these conceptechnics are used to excite theory to travel at the speed of thought, as sonic theorist Kool Keith suggested in 1987. TechnoTheory, CultStuds et allose their flabby bulk, their lazy, pompous, lard-arsed, top-down dominance, becoming but a single component in a thought synthesizer which moves along several planes at once, which tracks Machine Music's lines of force . Far from needing theory's help, music today is already more conceptual than at any point this century, pregnant with thoughtprobes waiting to be activated, switched on, misused. So More Brilliant than the Sun draws more of its purpose from track subtitles than from TechnoTheory, or even science fiction. These conceptechnics are then released from the holding pens of their brackets, to migrate and mutate across the entire communication landscape. Stolen from Sleevenote Manifestos, adapted from label fictions, driven as far and as fast as pOSSible, they misshape until they become devices to drill into the new sensory experiences, endoscopes to magnify the new mindstates Machine Music is inducing. More Brilliant than the Sun's achievement, therefore, is to deSign, manufacture, fabricate, synthesize, cut, paste and edit a so-called artificial discontinuum for the Futurhythmachine. Rejecting today's ubiquitous emphasis on black sound's necessary ethical allegiance to the street, this project opens up the new plane of Sonic Fiction, the secret life of forms, the discontinuum of AfroDiasporic Futurism, the chain reaction of PhonoFiction. It moves through the explosive forces which technology ignites in us, the temporal architecture of inner space, audiosocial space, living space, where postwar alienation breaks down into the 21St C alien. From Sun Ra to 4 Hero, today's alien discontinuum therefore operates not through continuities, retentions, genealogies or inheritances but rather through intervals, gaps, breaks. It turns away from roots; it opposes common sense with the force of the fictional and the power of falsity. One side effect of the alien discontinuum is the rejection of any and all notions of a compulsory black condition. Where journalism still insists on a solid state known as 'blackness', More Brilliant dissolves this solidarity with a corpse into a f1uidarity maintained and exacerbated by soundmachines. Today's cyborgs are too busy manufacturing themselves across time- space to disintensify themselves with all the Turing Tests for transatlantic, transeuropean and transafrican consciousness: affirmation, keeping it real, representing, staying true to the game, respect due, staying black. Alien Music today deliberately fails all these Tests, these putrid corpses of petrified moralism: it treats them with utter indifference; it replaces them with nothing whatsoever. It deserts forever the nauseating and bizarre ethic of 'redemption'. AfroDiasporic Futurism has assembled itself along inhuman routes, and it takes artificial thought to reveal this. Such relief: jaws unclench, as conviction collapses. Where crits of CyberCult still gather, 99.9%of them will lament the disembodiment of the human by technology. But machines don't distance you from your emotions, in fact quite the opposite. Sound machines make you feel more intensely, along a broader band of emotional spectra than ever before in the 20th Century. Sonically speaking, the posthuman era is not one of disembodiment but the exact reverse: it's a hyperembodiment, via the Technics SL 1200. A non-sound scientist like Richard Dawkins 'talks very happily about cultural viruses,' argues Sadie Plant, 'but doesn't think that he himself is a viral contagion.' Migrating from the lab to the studio, Sonic Science not only talks about cultural viruses, it is itself a viral contagion. It's a sensational infection by the spread of what Ishmael Reed terms antiplagues. Machine Music doesn't call itself science because it controls technology, but because music is the artform most thoroughly undermined and recombinated and reconfigured by technics. Scientists set processes in motion which swallow them up: the scientist's brain is caught up in the net. Acid's alien frequency modulation turns on its dj- producers Phuture and Sleezy D and begins to 'stab your brain' and 'disrupt thought patterns'. Yet in magnifying such hitherto ignored intersections of sound and science fiction - the nexus this project terms Sonic Fiction or PhonoFiction - More Brilliant paradoxically ends up with a portrait of music today far more accurate than any realistic account has managed. This is because most recent accounts of Black Music - those which form the dominant humanist strain in the commemoration of Black Music, its official histories - are more than anything wish fulfilments: scenarios in which Acid never eXisted, in which Electronic Jazz never arrived, in which the Era of the Rhythmachine never happened. By contrast, More Brilliant is a mechanography, an omnidirectional exploration into mechano-informatics, the secret life of machines which opens up the vast and previously unsuspected coevolution of machines and humans in late 20th C Black Atlantic Futurism. Alien Music is all in the breaks: the distance between Tricky and what you took to be the limits of Black Music, the gap between Underground Resistance and what you took Black Music to be, between listening to Miles uMacero's He Loved Him Madly and crossing all thresholds with and through it, leaving every old belief system: rock, jazz, soul, Electro, HipHop, House, Acid, Drum'n'Bass, electronics, Techno and dub - forever. The mayday signal of Black Atlantic Futurism is unrecognizability, as either Black or Music. Sonic Futurism doesn't locate you in tradition; instead it dislocates you from origins. It uproutes you by inducing a gulf crisis, a perceptual daze rendering today's sonic discontinuum immediately audible. The Futurist producer can not be trusted with music's heritage. Realizing this, UK and US dance media spring forward, to maintain these traditions the producer always abandons. Media's role is to defend an essence, by warding off all possible infections: journalists become missionaries on behalf of HipHop; they battle for the soul of Techno. Which is why at Century's End you tune into sensory frequencies undetectable to the happy tinnitus of good solid journalism. You are willingly mutated by intimate machines, abducted by audio into the populations of your bodies. Sound machines throw you onto the shores of the skin you're in. The hypersensual cyborg experiences herself as a galaxy of audiotactile sensations . You are not censors but sensors, not aesthetes but kinaesthetes. You are sensationalists. You are the newest mutants incubated in womb- speakers. Your mother, your first sound. The bedroom, the party, the dancefloor, the rave: these are the labs where the 21st C nervous systems assemble themselves, the matrices of the Futurhythmachinic Discontinuum. The future is a much better guide to the present than the past. Be prepared, be ready to trade everything you know about the history of music for a single glimpse of its future.

### AT Abstraction

[omitted]

### AT Ontological

[omitted]

## AT Ableism

[omitted]

## AT Cap

### Impact Turn

#### Don’t be a downer – capitalism and its desire for dissipation is the only route to *inorganic* emancipation: their economical open-ness is both doomed by the angular momentum of capital and their own rejection of dissolutory horror offered by the Outside.

Negarestani 11

(Reza “Drafting the Inhuman: Conjectures on Capitalism and Organic Necrocracy” The Speculative Turn, 2011)

As Nick Land has elaborated in The Thirst for Annihilation as well as his essays, what brings about the possibility of this weird marriage between human praxis and inhuman emancipation is the tortuous economy of dissipation inherent to capitalism as its partially repressed desire for meltdown.5 Although the economy of dissipation can be captured by humans through a libidinal materialist participation with the techno-capitalist singularity, it ultimately escapes the gravity of humans and entails their dissolution into the inorganic exteriority. Capitalism in this sense is not an attainable state but rather a dissipative (anti-essence) tendency or process which moves along the detours of organizational complexity, increasing commodification and convoluted syntheses of techné and physis so as to ultimately deliver human’s conservative horizon into an unbound state of dissolution. Immunological impulses of capitalism against its implicit desire for meltdown are doomed to fail as capitalism fully gains it angular momentum by reaping planetary resources and conceiving its irreparably schizophrenic image. Machinic desire can seem a little inhuman, as it rips up political cultures, deletes traditions, dissolves subjectivities, and hacks through security apparatuses, tracking a soulless tropism to zero control. This is because what appears to humanity as the history of capitalism is an invasion from the future by an artificial intelligent space that must assemble itself entirely from its enemy’s resources.6 It is this singularized deliverance of the human to the state of dissolution—concomi- tant with its pulverizing impact on the correlation between thought and the self-love of man (viz. organic survivalism)—that assigns capitalism an inhuman emancipative role. This model of emancipation is comparable with H.P. Lovecraft’s fantastic concept ‘holocaust of freedom’ which celebrates the consummation of human doom with human emancipation. Thus through a politico-economic reappropriation of Freud’s the- ory of the death-drive, Nick Land identifies capital [is] as a planetary singularity toward utter dissipation whose dynamism becomes more complicated as it circuitously verges upon zero. Once the commodity system is established there is no longer a need for an autonomous cultural impetus into the order of the abstract object. Capital attains its own ‘angular momentum’, perpetuating a run-away whirlwind of dissolution, whose hub is the virtual zero of impersonal metropolitan accumulation. At the peak of its productive prowess the hu- man animal is hurled into a new nakedness, as everything stable is progressively liquidat- ed in the storm.7

# AT Counterplan

### Perm

#### Perm: Do the aff then the CP.

[omitted]

### Openness DA

[omitted]

# AT Topic

### Hate Speech

[omitted]

### Journalism

#### [tag omitted – you need to line this down]

Eshun 98 [Eshun, Kodwo (concept engineer). *More Brilliant Than The Sun: Adventures in Sonic Fiction.* London: Quartet Books, 1998. pp. 00[-007]–00[-006]. // WWXR]

Allegedly at odds with the rock press, dance-press writing also turns its total inability to describe any kind of rhythm into a virtue, invoking a white Brit routine of pubs and clubs, of business as usual, the bovine sense of good blokes together. You can see that the entire British dance press - with its hagiographies and its geographies, its dj recipes, its boosterism, its personality profiles - constitutes a colossal machine for maintaining rhythm as an unwritable, ineffable mystery. And this is why Trad dance-music journalism is nothing more than lists and menus, bits and bytes: meagre, miserly, mediocre. All today's journalism is nothing more than a giant inertia engine to put the brakes on breaks, a moronizer placing all thought on permanent pause, a futureshock absorber, forever shielding its readers from the future's cuts, tracks, scratches. Behind the assumed virtue of keeping rhythm mute, there is a none-too-veiled hostility towards analyzing rhythm at all. Too many ideas spoil the party. Too much speculation kills 'dance music', by 'intellectualizing' it to death. The fuel this inertia engine runs on is fossil fuel: the live show, the proper album, the Real Song, the Real Voice, the mature, the musical, the pure, the true, the proper, the intelligent, breaking America: all notions that stink of the past, that maintain a hierarchy of the senses, that petrify music into a solid state in which everyone knows where they stand, and what real music really is. And this is why nothing is more fun than spoiling this terminally stupid sublime, this insistence that Great Music speaks for itself.

# Extra

Some cards that I thought were decent but didn’t make the final version of the aff. Also some cards that were relevant to another aff I never ended up finishing, about sound studies more broadly.

#### Geotraumatics provides a praxis for being open to the Outside. Geotrauma caused by solar storms disrupts nonvocal communications like radio waves and electronic media – injecting the possibility of solar disruption into geotraumatics subverts the regime of logic and signs.

Negarestani 8 [Negarestani, Reza (akhtian menace). *Cyclonopedia: Complicity with Anonymous Materials*. Melbourne: re.press, 2008, print. // WWXR]

\*ellipses in the original.

SONIC HOLOCAUST. The Earth's ionosphere is composed of ionised territories above the Earth's surface. These stratified regions - whose distribution over the Earth's surface is also under the influence of the Sun's thermo-diurnal activities (see Fig. 24) — directly affect radio waves, mainly because of the presence of free electrons. These layers are classified according to increasing altitude and are arranged in approximately horizontal stratified layers. When a radio wave travels through the ionosphere, its electrical field imparts an oscillatory motion to electrons which radiate this energy in turn, like miniature antennae. This modifies the velocity of the wave propagation. During solar storms, however, this seemingly crypto-bureaucratic stratified configuration crashes and is re-composed according to the radical instability of regions and the rabid agitation of electrons triggered by solar electromagnetic surges. Such electromagnetic disturbances also limit the amount of appropriated information that can be carried in the HF spectrum, a war descending to blacken communication systems through a sonic holocaust (Solar Rattle), torching every particle with commotion, a 'Holocaust of Freedom\*. In the presence of solar tempests, listening is both inevitable and impossible. A military communications operator encounters a very diverse and disturbing range of sonic anomalies, all paralyzing the communication device (from radar jamming to solar outage), putting the operator in a direct and bizarrely close encounter with the sonic plague of Solar Rattle. This is a very personal experience for all radio operators during wartime; when the gate opens, the operator is sucked in ... and finds himself within another milieu constituted only of sounds — not human, but implacably anti-anthropomorphic sound molecules, electric death rattles, absolutely unnerving screeches, molecular storms, droning sounds corresponding with the terrible drone heard overhead as Druj-Nasu (an avatar of Druj, the Mother of Abominations) rushes from the north mountains as a fly to seize another corpse. Radio transmission in stormy weather broadcasts the non-orchestral body of Beelzebub, the Lord of Flies (\*I romp around with the sound of flies'). The radio operator perceives warmachines as sonic entities being devoured by WAR itself, sonically sworn to consume the entire battlefield in the form of a Solar Rattle engineered by the earth's magnetic conspiracy towards the Sun which incites a tellurian insurgency unknown even to the black revolution of solar catastrophe. The Druj\*Nasu36 comes and rushes upon him, from the regions of the north, in the shape of a raging fly, with knees and tail sticking out, droning without end. and like unto the foulest Khrafstms27 (Xrafstra). (Vendidad, Videvdad or The Book of the Laws against Demons. Anti-Druj Laws. Far-gard 7. Purity Laws) ant mraot ahuro mazdS, Lshare pa sea para-irisliiu spitama zarathushtra us iiaca baodho aval acsha druxsh \xi nasush upa-dvasaiti apaxedhraeibyo naemacibyo maxshi kehrpa erckhaitva frashnaosh apazadhangho akaranem driwy& yatha zoi-zhdishtaish khrafstraish.2\* On a global scale, the Solar Rattle is the ultimate musicality: It registers any message-oriented or signaling datastream as a parasitic sub-noise ambient within itself. The Solar Rattle rewrites every datastream as an Unsign, even beyond any pattern of disinformation. TtLLURO-MAGNfTic conspiracy towaros the Sun. In Tellurian Insurgency, unlike the Deleu2e-Guattarian New Earth (A Thousand Plateaus, The Geology of Morals: Who Does the Earth Think It Is?) the strategy of stratification is to engineer a perverse immanence with the Sun. The highly stratified structure of Ionosphere / Magnetosphere provides the Earth with secret warmachines older than the Sun itself, with which it traps solar winds (high-energy particles of the sun) and turns them into peculiarly planetary sonic entities. Ionospheric strata have been customized and arranged in such a way that they reinforce the earth's surface with demonic currents and forces by capturing solar winds, bringing the earth's surface and its biosphere into an immanence with the Sun and the burning core of the Earth through a sonic axis. If hell is made on the Earth-Sun axis stretching from the Earth's burning core (the Insider) to the Sun, then hell cannot be grasped merely in terms of the Sun and its capitalism. The Insider or the black egg which the Earth is hatching within itself (ge hinnom) extends the geopolitical reality of hell beyond the boundaries of the Solar Empire. Hell, in this sense, is not exclusively owned by the Sun and its thermonuclear holocaust. (Note: The Valley of Hinnom has frequently been referred to as Hell; its Hebrew / Greek etymologic origin returns to ge hinnom, from which Jahannam, the Koranic word for Hell, was derived. In both Christian and Islamic texts, Ge hinnom (or Hell) has been regarded as 'the place down there' or the Lake of Fire, having numerous geochemical attributes; Ge hinnom or Hell occulturally confirms the geotraumatic lines of the burning ocean of the Earth's core, or what Mircea Eliade calls Cthelll.) If occult entities choose the Solar Rattle as their sonic wave-net (propaga-tion grid and model of cacophony), it is because the Solar Rattle generates vertical and horizontal fields of immanence and vigorously dissipates lines of communication at the end of the Sign. It is not an accident or an inven-tion of contemporary pulp-horror fictions that the sonic cartography of Near and middle-eastern occult rituals (i.e. summoning, conjuration and xeno-communication) is essentially constituted of incomprehensible audio-traumatic murmurs and machinic ambience. The Solar Rattle and its Chthonic auditory agitations were already embedded within the immense capacity of vowelless alphabets of Middle and Near Eastern languages (Aramaic, Hebrew, Pahlavi. etc.) to artificialize a diverse range of molecular sounds and sonic compositions. Sorcerers and summoners know very well that to communicate radically with the Outside, they must first strip their communication networks (cults?) from informatic signaling systems, grasping communication at the end of sign and informatic reality. This is where the Solar Rattle installs communicative channels along with the Sun-Cthelll axis of electro-magnetized Hell.

#### State bad

Matts & Tynan 12 [Matts, Tim, and Aidan Tynan (Cardiff University). “Geotrauma and the Eco-Clinic: Nature, Violence, and Ideology.” *symploke* Vol. 20, Nos. 1-2 (2012) ISSN 1069-0697, 91-110 // WWXR]

Deleuze and Guattari are not proposing a new psychology, a new means of resolution, but a new means of thinking the problems involved and this, as we shall see, is where the role of ecology comes in. What the psychological phenomenon of Oedipus ultimately points to is a problem of political subjectivity, which is precisely what psychoanalysis, with its notion with interminable neurosis, doesn’t illuminate: the modern “state form” of social organization requires subjects who are always already submitted to the rule of the state, already subject to a law whose right is presupposed as a condition of their subjectivity. What links the libidinal-economic problem of Oedipus and the political problem of the state has to do with violence and its forms of accomplishment: what kind of violence is psychic repression, what kind of violence is social repression? Both of these questions are united by the problem of how to render violence thinkable beyond the violence of a law that presupposes its own efficacy. If the state is characterised as having a “monopoly on violence,” this is so because in one blow it exerts its power and the right to exert its power. It operates by a kind of double violence, which “consists in capturing while simultaneously constituting a right to capture” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 448). Oedipal psychology is the subjective analogue of this, in that neurotic desire is premised on the very law against which it struggles. State violence, though it certainly can and is applied directly, is in essence “indirect” in that it forms a “structural” condi- tion of subjecti cation itself (447). Deleuze and Guattari’s claim is that the state, through the indirectness of its “magical” pre-accomplishment, actually mystifies violence (460). What we have been calling the antinomy of ecologi- cal reason is a version of this mystification.

#### Words bad

Deleuze and Guattari 87 [Gilles and Felix, French bastards, *Capitalism and Schizophrenia: A Thousand Plateaus*. University of Minnesota Press. pp. 68-70]

The preferred method would be severely restrictive, as opposed to the expansive method that places signs on all strata or signifier in all signs (although at the limit it may forgo signs entirely). First, there exist forms of expression without signs (for example, the genetic code has nothing to do with a language). It is only under certain conditions that strata can be said to include signs; signs cannot be equated with language in general but are defined by regimes of statements that are so many real usages or functions of language. Then why retain the word sign for these regimes, which formalize an expression without designating or signifying the simultaneous contents, which are formalized in a different way? Signs are not signs of a thing; they are signs of deterritorialization and reterritorialization, they mark a certain threshold crossed in the course of these movements, and it is for this reason that the word should be retained (as we have seen, this applies even to animal "signs"). Next, if we consider regimes of signs using this restrictive definition, we see that they are not, or not necessarily, signifiers. Just as signs designate only a certain formalization of expression in a determinate group of strata, signifiance itself designates only one specific regime among a number of regimes existing in that particular formalization. Just as there are asemiotic expressions, or expressions without signs, there are asemiological regimes of signs, asignifying signs, both on the strata and on the plane of consistency. The most that can be said of signifiance is that it characterizes one regime, which is not even the most interesting or modern or contemporary one, but is perhaps only more pernicious, cancerous, and despotic than the others, and more steeped in illusion than they. In any case, content and expression are never reducible to signified-signifier. And (this is the second problem) neither are they reducible to base-superstructure. One can no more posit a primacy of content as the determining factor than a primacy of expression as a signifying system. Expression can never be made into a form reflecting content, even if one endows it with a "certain" amount of independence and a certain potential for reacting, if only because so-called economic content already has a form and even forms of expression that are specific to it. Form of content and form of expression involve two parallel formalizations in presupposition: it is obvious that their segments constantly intertwine, embed themselves in one another; but this is accomplished by the abstract machine from which the two forms derive, and by machinic assemblages that regulate their relations. If this parallelism is replaced by a pyramidal image, then content (including its form) becomes an economic base of production displaying all of the characteristics of the Abstract; the assemblages become the first story of a superstructure that, as such, is necessarily situated within a State apparatus; the regimes of signs and forms of expression become the second story of the superstructure, defined by ideology. It isn't altogether clear where language should go, since the great Despot decided that it should be reserved a special place, as the common good of the nation and the vehicle for information. Thus one misconstrues the nature of language, which exists only in heterogeneous regimes of signs, and rather than circulating information distributes contradictory orders. It misconstrues the nature of regimes of signs, which express organizations of power or assemblages and have nothing to do with ideology as the supposed expression of a content (ideology is a most execrable concept obscuring all of the effectively operating social machines). It misconstrues the nature of organizations of power, which are in no way located within a State apparatus but rather are everywhere, effecting formalizations of content and expression, the segments of which they intertwine. Finally, it misconstrues the nature of content, which is in no way economic "in the last instance," since there are as many directly economic signs or expressions as there are noneconomic contents. Nor can the status of social formations be analyzed by throwing some signifier into the base, or vice versa, or a bit of phallus or castration into political economy, or a bit of economics or politics into psychoanalysis.

#### Ontology argument/framing/at OOO

Goodman 10 [Goodman, Steve (hyperdub). *Sonic Warfare: Sound, Affect, and the Ecology of Fear*. Cambridge: MIT University Press, 2010. Print. // WWXR]

pp. 81 – 83 “13.7 Billion B.C.: The Ontology of Vibrational Force.”

Outlining the affective micropolitics of sonic warfare demands a specifically tuned methodology. Drawing from philosophy, cultural studies, physics, biology, fiction, and military and musical history, an ontology of vibrational force can be pieced together that traverses disciplines. An ontology of vibrational force delves below a philosophy of sound and the physics of acoustics toward the basic processes of entities affecting other entities. Sound is merely a thin slice, the vibrations audible to humans or animals. Such an orientation therefore should be differentiated from a phenomenology of sonic effects centered on the perceptions of a human subject, as a ready-made, interiorized human center of being and feeling. While an ontology of vibrational force exceeds a philosophy of sound, it can assume the temporary guise of a sonic philosophy, a sonic intervention into thought, deploying concepts that resonate strongest with sound/ noise/music culture, and inserting them at weak spots in the history of Western philosophy, chinks in its character armor where its dualism has been bruised, its ocularcentrism blinded. The theoretical objective here resonates with Kodwo Eshun in More Brilliant Than the Sun when he objects to cultural studies approaches in which “theory always comes to Music’s rescue. The organization of sound interpreted historically, politically, socially. Like a headmaster, theory teaches today’s music a thing or two about life. It subdues music’s ambition, reins it in, restores it to its proper place.” Instead, if they are not already, we place theory under the dominion of sonic affect, encouraging a conceptual mutation. Sound comes to the rescue of thought rather than the inverse, forcing it to vibrate, loosening up its organized or petrified body. As Eshun prophetically wrote at the end of the twentieth century, “Far from needing theory’s help, music today is already more conceptual than at any point this century, pregnant with thought probes waiting to be activated, switched on, misused.” An ontology of vibrational force objects to a number of theoretical orientations. First, the linguistic imperialism that subordinates the sonic to semiotic registers is rejected for forcing sonic media to merely communicate meaning, losing sight of the more fundamental expressions of their material potential as vibrational surfaces, or oscillators. Despite being endlessly inspired by intensive confrontation with bass frequencies, neither should an ontology of vibrational force be misconceived as either a naive physicalism in which all vibrational affect can be reduced scientifically. Such a reductionist materialism that merely reduces the sonic to a quantifiable objectivity is inadequate in that it neglects incorporeal affects. A concern for elementary vibrations must go beyond their quantification in physics into primary frequencies. On the other hand, the phenomenological anthropocentrism of almost all musical and sonic analysis, obsessed with individualized, subjective feeling, denigrates the vibrational nexus at the altar of human audition, thereby neglecting the agency distributed around a vibrational encounter and ignoring the nonhuman participants of the nexus of experience. Rather, it is a concern for potential vibration and the abstract rhythmic relation of oscillation, which is key. What is prioritized here is the in-between of oscillation, the vibration of vibration, the virtuality of the tremble. Vibrations always exceed the actual entities that emit them. Vibrating entities are always entities out of phase with themselves. A vibratory nexus exceeds and precedes the distinction between subject and object, constituting a mesh of relation in which discreet entities apprehend each other’s vibrations. Not just amodal, this vibrational anarchitecture, it will be suggested, produces the very division between subjective and objective, time and space. If this ontology of vibrational force can help construct a conception of a politics of frequency, then it must go beyond the opposition between a celebration of the jouissance of sonic physicality and the semiotic significance of its symbolic composition or content. But enough negative definitions. If affect describes the ability of one entity to change another from a distance, then here the mode of affection will be understood as vibrational. In The Ethics, Spinoza describes an ecology of movements and rest, speeds and slownesses, and the potential of entities to affect and be affected. This ecology will be constructed as a vectorial field of “affectiles” (affect + projectile), or what William James refers to as pulsed vectors of feeling. As an initiation of a politics of frequency, it resonates with the ballistics of the battlefield as acoustic force field described by the futurists. This vectorial field of sonic affectiles is aerodynamic, but it can also be illuminated by rhythmic models of liquid instability that constitute a kind of abstract vorticism. This vibrational ontology begins with some simple premises. If we subtract human perception, everything moves. Anything static is so only at the level of perceptibility. At the molecular or quantum level, everything is in motion, is vibrating. Equally, objecthood, that which gives an entity duration in time, makes it endure, is an event irrelevant of human perception. All that is required is that an entity be felt as an object by another entity. All entities are potential media that can feel or whose vibrations can be felt by other entities. This is a realism, albeit a weird, agitated, and nervous one. An ontology of vibrational force forms the backdrop to the affective agency of sound systems (the sonic nexus), their vibrational ontology (rhythmanalysis), and their modes of contagious propagation (audio virology). In its primary amodality and secondary affinity to the sonic, a discussion of vibrational ecologies also helps counter ocularcentric (modeled on vision as dominant sensory modality) conceptions of cyberspace, contributing to a notion of virtual space that cuts across analog and digital domains.

#### Centrality of affect/inability of textualist approaches to succeed/ambiguity of sonic warfare

Goodman 10 [Goodman, Steve (hyperdub). *Sonic Warfare: Sound, Affect, and the Ecology of Fear*. Cambridge: MIT University Press, 2010. Print. // WWXR]

pp. 9 – 13, “2001: What is Sonic Warfare?”

When Attali asked us to probe into the “fundamental noise” that scrambles contemporary codes of communication, he was implicitly signaling the centrality of affect. It is at a subsignifying level, at the level of intensity where a “crossing of semantic wires” occurs, that a map of affective tonality can be constructed. Sonic Warfare forces an engagement with theories of affect and the imperceptible and sidesteps those preoccupations of cultural studies’ critical musicological approaches that tend to limit discussion around issues of representation, identity, and cultural meaning. The linguistic, textualist, and social-constructivist perspectives that dominated cultural theory in the 1980s and 1990s are of little use to us here. Even Attali, against the critical musicological obsession with the meaning or signification of sound, points out that music itself “cannot be equated with a language . . . [because it] never has a stable reference to a code of the linguistic type.” If it must be construed as a language, then it is one that abandons narrative; it is not myth coded in sounds instead of words, but rather “language without meaning.” Affect comes not as either a supplement or a replacement to the preoccupations of cultural theories of representation, but rather as an approach that inserts itself ontologically prior to such approaches, thereby examining the very conditions of possibility for a sonic materialism and the ethico-aesthetic paradigm it would entail. As opposed to sound as text, the dimension explored here is that of sound as force. Sonic warfare then, is the use of force, both seductive and violent, abstract and physical, via a range of acoustic machines (biotechnical, social, cultural, artistic, conceptual), to modulate the physical, affective, and libidinal dynamics of populations, of bodies, of crowds. Before the activation of causal or semantic, that is, cognitive listening, the sonic is a phenomenon of contact and displays, through an array of autonomic responses, a whole spectrum of affective powers. Sound has a seductive power to caress the skin, to immerse, to sooth, beckon, and heal, to modulate brain waves and massage the release of certain hormones within the body. Discussion of the physiological affects of sonic weaponry has usually centered on intensity (acoustic power), the ultrasonic or the infrasonic; the very loud, the very high pitched, and the very low pitched. At high sound pressure levels, the ear is directly damaged. Need we be reminded that noise, like anything else that touches you, can be a source of both pleasure and pain and that “beyond a certain limit, it becomes an immaterial weapon of death. The ear, which transforms vibration into electric impulses addressed to the brain, can be damaged, and even destroyed, when the frequency of a sound exceeds 20,000 hertz, or when its intensity exceeds 80 decibels. Diminished intellectual capacity, accelerated respiration and heartbeat, hypertension, slowed digestion, neurosis, altered diction: these are the consequences of excessive sound in the environment.” Curtis Roads notes that “the force of an explosion, for example, is an intense acoustic shock wave” and calls these potent frequencies and amplitudes “perisonic intensities (from the Latin periculus meaning ‘dangerous’).”A different conception of sonic warfare is perhaps suggested, in prototype form, by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari in A Thousand Plateaus. Such a conception deviates from an intrinsic relation between noise and sonic violence suggested from futurism through to Attali and beyond, and instead implies a kind of guerrilla sonics out of which any militarized investment would be constructed only through capture. Rather than the conventional monotonous artistic alliance between noise and destruction in a transgressive attempt to shock, noise instead becomes a vibrational field of rhythmic potential. A “sonic war machine” along these lines would be defined by its rhythmic consistency, would not take violence or noise as its primary object, but rather would concentrate its forces on affective mobilization and contagion. Its politics of frequency would entail the way in which vibrational force would be captured, monopolized, and redeployed. This range of conceptions may initially be outlined in terms of a continuum. At opposite poles of the sonic warfare continuum then, two basic tendencies could be identified, two poles of this continuum of sonic force, perhaps two inverse modes or tactical tendencies. One is militarized, and the other engages in a warfare with an altogether different set of priorities. In abstract terms, these extensive and intensive tendencies of audiosocial radiation can also be usefully described as, on the one hand, centrifugal, efferent, repulsive, producing a movement that spirals out from source, and on the other hand, a centripetal, afferent, attractional power producing a movement that spirals in toward a source. Clearly one tactical deployment of sound is subordinated to the strategic aim of crowd dispersal, to the dissipation of a collective energy, to repulsion and dissolution of clusters, and to the individualization of the movement of bodies. On the other side, we have a tactical deployment whose objective is that of intensification, to the heightening of collective sensation, an attractive, almost magnetic, or vortical force, a force that sucks bodies in toward its source. These dynamics may be thought meteorologically in terms of heat and pressure, as in “the eye of the storm,” or in terms of the turbulence of fluid mechanics: a power to generate a rhythmic rotation, intensification, and collective individuation (to render the crowd as a body in its own right). In this instance, the aim of mobilizing bodies extensively is accompanied and perhaps overridden by the primary objective of the intensive mobilization of affect. Crucially, between these two coexistent tendencies, the attractive and repulsive power of sonic force, the issue is obviously not simply one of good or bad. Rather, their ambivalence indicates some of the emergent features central to the strategies and tactics of control within contemporary capitalism. The relation between these two tendencies of sonic force must be thought through very carefully. Not only must the extensive tendencies of “sonic war machines” be examined—their abilities to make bodies move—but also the range of intensive tendencies involved in the deployment of sound system technologies—their modulation of affective tone. While the centrifugal, repulsive deployment of sound machines (cultural, not just technical) can appear to be the preoccupation of military and police functions, it would be futile to naively celebrate the centripetal attractive power of the sound system. The problem of sonic warfare, strategic, tactical, and logistical, is clearly a complex one. In many compelling sonic cultural situations, we have a mixture of both, where, for example, sound is so overwhelming that we feel forced to take leave, but instead, resisting that initial gut feeling, the autonomic or involuntary reaction to take flight, we stay to enjoy. Conversely, a sonic fascism may occupy both poles of this continuum. To help clarify this analysis, key insights on sonic media extracted from philosophy, fiction, cultural theory, popular music, and the intersection of science and art will be examined against the backdrop of military urbanism in order to identify the new sensations mobilizing an emergent generation of practitioners and theorists. Much speculation can also be found in conspiracy theory, which is only natural when research related to the defense industry is concerned. These sonic fictions and urban myths can form a starting point for a more careful philosophical investigation. For, in addition to the paranoid sensationalism that enlivens these often spurious accounts, they remind us that the sonic (and un- sonic) body is always poised precariously in a processual disequilibrium with the acoustic environment, and that even minute perturbations of this environment can set in motion resonant events and generate and provoke unforeseen cultural mutation. Moreover, if Jacques Attali is right, then in addition to the intense perceptual encounters sound system cultures can produce through music and noise, they may also emit transposable and prophetic diagrams of sociality, equipped with novel armories of affects, percepts, and concepts. As already noted, Sonic Warfare will not attempt to be comprehensive about the full range of sound-affect conjunctions but will instead concentrate on the strange nexus of sound and fear. If Brian Massumi was correct when he argued in the early 1990s that fear was our overriding affective syndrome, the “inherence in the body of the multi-causal matrix . . . recognizable as late capitalist human existence,” what critical urbanist Mike Davis has dubbed the ecology of fear, then analysis of these sensory tactics of affective mobilization and contagion will only become more pressing. The sonic is particularly attuned to examining one strand of this ecology of fear: dread. Sonic experience will be placed in the context of a resonant cosmos that cuts across the duality of physical and emotional processes. The point of constructing this ontology of vibrational force is not to naturalize cultural phenomena in order to deny any possible tactical intervention, nor to suggest nature as a force of spontaneous vitality and therefore emancipatory power. Rather, the resort to a basic, indifferent vibrational plane exposes the inhuman entities that haunt the nature-culture continuum as it transects the networked affective battlefields of twenty-first-century geostrategy. The production of the ecology of fear is intensified under the shadow of “shock and awe.” An investigation into asymmetric attacks and deployments waged on the affective status quo within the microcosm of the sonic might have a much broader significance.

#### Framework/ROTB

Thompson 14 [Thompson, Marie Suzanne. “Beyond Unwanted Sound: Noise, Affect and Aesthetic Moralism.” Doctoral dissertation. *International Centre for Music Studies*, Newcastle University. February 2014. Print. pp. 232–235 // WWXR]

Although I have been cautious to emphasize that noise is not an exclusively sonic phenomenon, this study could be understood as part of a larger and ongoing project exploring the relationship between sound and affectivity. I would suggest that affect studies and sound studies are two fields that can be productively thought together, given the primary role of affect within sonic experiences. I have suggested that the relationship between noise and certain configurations of affect is somewhat obvious, in that it is commonly associated with feelings of irritation, unease or discomfort. The relations between sound and/or music and affect are similarly immediate. If affect theory seeks to explore the parts of the experiential that are omitted by hermeneutic and discursive modes of analysis, then the sonic and the musical – as those which are so frequently resistant to semantic interpretation – provide ideal contexts from which to consider the implications, influences and effects of affectivity. There are, for example, those familiar sounds that put as at ease, or those ominous, out-of-place sounds that call us to alert, filling us with a sense of dread. Likewise, music is frequently used to encourage or emphasize a particular mood or create a general ambience: there are pre-party soundtracks, romantic-night-in mix tapes, chill-out compilations and our personalized gym playlists that help us run faster for longer. Meanwhile, advertisers and marketing companies have been finding ever more effective ways to use sound as a means of getting under their target audience’s skin and sucking them in before they can realize what is happening to them. Yet the idea that sound and music are capable of influencing the ways in which listeners act and feel is by no means new. Though expressed using different terminology, the affective capacity of sound and music has been recognized since Antiquity. Plato, for example, expressed anxiety at the degenerative influence of certain musical sounds: whereas ‘simple music’ was thought to encourage ‘temperance’, complex sounds and particular modes, rhythms and instruments were understood to weaken the spirit and encourage meanness, corruption and promiscuity.4 Such music was thus considered a threat to the moral cohesion of society. This Platonic notion of music’s affective power and subsequent social influence is echoed both by R. Murray Schafer (for whom a good and harmonious soundscape mediates the good and harmonious relations of a society; and a noisy, dissonant soundscape mediates the bad and degenerative relations of a society), and the use of classical music as an affective deterrent (see Chapter Three). However, despite these connections, sound has been frequently overlooked in theories of affect, while sound studies and musicology have, for the most part, failed to pick up on contemporary developments in affect studies.5 This text has pointed to a way in which these two fields can be usefully connected. I have argued that an affective approach to noise is advantageous, in that it begins with what noise does rather than what noise means. Likewise, this exploration of noise has drawn attention to the affective power of sound: its capacity to frighten, disperse and alienate but also to generate feelings of belonging, excitement and community.6 In developing a materialist and non-anthropocentric approach to noise, there are thematic resonances with two, related intellectual trends that also connect with both the contemporary interest in the ‘dark side’ of media culture and the affective turn: new materialism and posthumanism. ‘New materialism’ (or ‘neo-materialism’) can be understood as distinct from dialectical materialism, typically drawing from a lineage that connects Spinoza-Bergson-Whitehead-Deleuze-Irigaray-Haraway- Barad-Grosz-Braidotti, rather than Hegel-Marx-Adorno.7 On the one hand, new materialism can be understood as a response to calls for attention to be (re)turned to the body, materiality and matter; on the other, it can be connected to a ‘long genealogy’ of materialist feminism that deals precisely with these thematics.8 As Rick Dolphijn and Iris Van der Tuin argue, new materialism ‘explores a monist perspective, devoid of the dualisms that have dominated the humanities (and sciences) until today, by giving special attention to matter, which has been so neglected by dualist thought. Cartesian dualism, after all, has favored mind.’9 Rather than understanding matter to be inert and passive, new materialism has suggested that matter can be thought of as vibrant, active and affective. The emergence of new materialism might be understood as a contemporary manifestation of ‘posthumanism’: indeed, Diana Coole and Samantha Frost describe ‘the avowed posthumanism’ of new materialist ontologies to be one of their ‘distinctive characteristics.’10 Like affect theory and new materialism, posthumanist thought looks to challenge the positioning and values ascribed to the liberal (Cartesian) subject and the primacy afforded to the human and human experience. As Cary Wolfe argues, it refutes the ‘fantasies of disembodiment and autonomy inherented from humanism’.11 Often drawing upon Donna Haraway’s figure of the Cyborg, posthumanism presents a reconsideration of the dualisms of human/machine, human/animal and mind/body. Posthumanism and new materialism, then, share my concern for de-centring the body-as-subject, choosing to recognize its ‘imbrication in technical, medical, informatic networks.’12 As with much posthumanist and new materialist thought, I have sought to think of the human as that which is not so much opposed to but operates with and is affected by nonhuman others. Noise, I have argued, points to this entanglement of entities and their environments. If silence (apropos Schafer) is what characterizes an ideal transcendentalism, then noise is the marker of a material, mutative and immanent milieu from which affected and affecting bodies – including (post)human bodies – cannot be disconnected.